arXiv:1612.03512v1 [math.CO] 12 Dec 2016

Ear Decompostion and Balanced 2-neighborly Simplicial Spheres

Hailun Zheng
Department of Mathematics
University of Washington
Seattle, WA 98195-4350, USA
hailunz@math.washington.edu

December 13, 2016

Abstract

We find the first two examples of non-octahedral balanced 2-neighborly spheres. Each construction is of dimension 3 and with 16 vertices. Along the way, we show that the rank-selected subcomplexes of a balanced simplicial sphere do not necessarily have an ear decomposition.

1 Introduction

A simplicial complex is called k-neighborly if every subset of vertices of size at most k is the set of vertices of one of its faces. Neighborly complexes, especially neighborly polytopes and spheres, are interesting objects to study. In the seminal work of McMullen [10] and Stanley [18], it was shown that in the class of polytopes and simplicial spheres, of a fixed dimension and with a fixed number of vertices, the cyclic polytope simultaneously maximizes all the face numbers. The d-dimensional cyclic polytope is $\lfloor \frac{d}{2} \rfloor$-neighborly. Since then, many other classes of neighborly polytopes have been discovered. We refer to [5], [17] and [14] for examples and constructions of neighborly polytopes. Meanwhile, the notion of neighborliness was extended to other classes of objects: for instance, neighborly cubical polytopes were defined and studied in [9], [8], and [16], and neighborly centrally symmetric polytopes and spheres were studied in [1], [7], [12], and [4].

One goal of this manuscript is to discuss a similar notion for balanced simplicial complexes. Balanced complexes were defined by Stanley in [19], where they were called completely balanced. A $(d-1)$-dimensional simplicial complex is called balanced if its graph is d-colorable. We say that a balanced simplicial complex is *balanced k-neighborly* if every set of k or fewer vertices with *distinct* colors forms a face. It is natural to ask whether apart from cross-polytopes, balanced k-neighborly polytopes or balanced k-neighborly spheres exist. To the best of our knowledge, no examples of such objects appear in the current literature, even for $k = 2$, and there is not even a plausible sharp upper bound conjecture for balanced spheres.

In this manuscript, we provide two constructions of balanced 2-neighborly 3-spheres with 16 vertices. In [15], Pfeifle, Pilaud and Santos, in answering the question of when a given graph is the graph of a polytope, studied the polytopality of Cartesian products of certain classes of non-polytopal graphs. As a consequence, our constructions show that the complete 4-partite graph on 16 vertices with parts of equal size is the graph of a 3-sphere.

In a different direction, it is also interesting to ask whether every rank-selected subcomplex of a balanced simplicial polytope or sphere has a convex ear decomposition. This statement, if

true, would imply that rank-selected subcomplexes of balanced simplicial polytopes possess certain weak Lefschetz properties, see Theorem 3.9 in [20]. As a consequence, it would also provide an alternative proof of the balanced Generalized Lower Bound Theorem, see Theorem 3.3 and Remark 3.4 in [11]. In this manuscript, we present examples giving a negative answer to this question for 3-dimensional spheres.

The structure of this manuscript is as follows. In Section 2, after reviewing basic definitions, we establish basic properties of balanced neighborly spheres; in particular, we prove that for some values of f_0, such spheres cannot exist. In Section 3, we present our first construction of a balanced 2-neighborly 3-sphere with 16 vertices. We also show that several of its rank-selected subcomplexes do not have an ear decomposition, and find two balanced non-shellable 3-balls as its subcomplexes. In Section 4, we provide our second construction of a balanced 2-neighborly 3-sphere with 16 vertices. It is different from the first one since all of its rank-selected subcomplexes have ear decompositions. Several other examples are provided in Section 5.

2 Basic properties of balanced neighborly spheres

A *simplicial complex* Δ with vertex set V is a collection of subsets $\sigma \subseteq V$, called *faces*, that is closed under inclusion, and such that for every $v \in V$, $\{v\} \in \Delta$. For $\sigma \in \Delta$, let $\dim \sigma := |\sigma| - 1$ and define the *dimension* of Δ, $\dim \Delta$, as the maximum dimension of the faces of Δ. We say that a simplicial complex Δ is *pure* if all of its facets have the same dimension.

If Δ is a simplicial complex and σ is a face of Δ, the *star* of σ in Δ is $\mathrm{st}_\Delta \sigma := \{\tau \in \Delta : \sigma \cup \tau \in \Delta\}$. We also define the *link* of σ in Δ as $\mathrm{lk}_\Delta \sigma := \{\tau - \sigma \in \Delta : \sigma \subseteq \tau \in \Delta\}$, and the *deletion* of a subset of vertices W from Δ as $\Delta \backslash W := \{\sigma \in \Delta : \sigma \cap W = \emptyset\}$. If Δ_1 and Δ_2 are simplicial complexes on disjoint vertex sets, then the join of Δ_1 and Δ_2, denoted $\Delta_1 * \Delta_2$, is the simplicial complex with vertex set $V(\Delta_1) \cup V(\Delta_2)$ whose faces are $\{\sigma_1 \cup \sigma_2 : \sigma_1 \in \Delta_1, \sigma_2 \in \Delta_2\}$.

A simplicial complex Δ is a *simplicial sphere* (resp. *simplicial ball*) if the geometric realization of Δ is homeomorphic to a sphere (resp. ball). A simplicial sphere is called *polytopal* if it is the boundary complex of a convex polytope. For instance, the boundary complex of an octahedron is a polytopal sphere; we will refer to it as an octahedral sphere. If Δ is a pure $(d-1)$-dimensional complex such that every $(d-2)$-dimensional face of Δ is contained in at most 2 facets, then the boundary complex of Δ consists of all $(d-2)$-dimensional faces that are contained in exactly one facet, as well as their subsets. The boundary complex of a simplicial d-ball is a simplicial $(d-1)$-sphere.

For a fixed field $\mathbf{k}$, we say that Δ is a $(d-1)$-dimensional $\mathbf{k}$-*homology sphere* if $\tilde{H}_i(\mathrm{lk}_\Delta \sigma; \mathbf{k}) \cong \tilde{H}_i(\mathbb{S}^{d-1-|\sigma|}; \mathbf{k})$ for every face $\sigma \in \Delta$ (including the empty face) and $i \geq -1$. A *homology d-ball* (over a field $\mathbf{k}$) is a d-dimensional simplicial complex Δ such that (i) Δ has the same homology as the d-dimensional ball, (ii) for every face F, the link of F has the same homology as the $(d-|F|)$-dimensional ball or sphere, and (iii) the boundary complex, $\partial\Delta := \{F \in \Delta \mid \tilde{H}_i(\mathrm{lk}_\Delta F) = 0, \forall i\}$, is a homology $(d-1)$-sphere. The classes of simplicial $(d-1)$-spheres and homology $(d-1)$-spheres coincide when $d \leq 3$. From now on we fix $\mathbf{k}$ and omit it from our notation.

Next we define a special structure that exists in some pure simplicial complexes.

Definition 2.1. An *ear decomposition* of a pure $(d-1)$-dimensional simplicial complex Δ is an ordered sequence $\Delta_1, \Delta_2, \cdots, \Delta_m$ of pure $(d-1)$-dimensional subcomplexes of Δ such that:

1. Δ_1 is a simplicial $(d-1)$-sphere, and for each $j = 2, 3, \cdots, m$, Δ_j is a simplicial $(d-1)$-ball.

2. For $2 \leq j \leq m$, $\Delta_j \cap (\cup_{i=1}^{j-1} \Delta_i) = \partial \Delta_j$.

3. $\cup_{i=1}^{m} \Delta_i = \Delta$.

We call Δ_1 the *initial complex*, and each Δ_j, $j \geq 2$, an *ear of this decompostion*. Notice that this definition is more general than Chari's original definition of a *convex ear decomposition*, see [3, Section 3.2], where the Δ_i's are required to be subcomplexes of the boundary complexes of polytopes. In particular, if a complex has no ear decomposition, then it has no convex ear decomposition. However, by the Steinitz theorem, all simplicial 2-spheres are polytopal, and hence also all simplicial 2-balls can be realized as subcomplexes of the boundary complexes of 3-dimensional polytopes. So for 2-dimensional simplicial complexes, the notion of an ear decomposition coincides with that of a convex ear decomposition.

A $(d-1)$-dimensional simplicial complex Δ is called *balanced* if the graph of Δ is d-colorable, or equivalently, there is a coloring map $\kappa : V \to [d]$ such that $\kappa(x) \neq \kappa(y)$ for any edge $\{x, y\} \in \Delta$. Here $[d] = \{1, 2, \cdots, d\}$ denotes the set of colors. A balanced simplicial complex is called *balanced k-neighborly* if every set of k or fewer vertices with distinct colors forms a face. For $S \subseteq [d]$, the subcomplex $\Delta_S := \{F \in \Delta : \kappa(F) \subseteq S\}$ is called the *rank-selected subcomplex* of Δ. We also define the *flag f-vector* $(f_S(\Delta) : S \subseteq [d])$ and the *flag h-vector* $(h_S(\Delta) : S \subseteq [d])$ of Δ, respectively, by letting $f_S(\Delta) := \#\{F \in \Delta : \kappa(F) = S\}$, where $f_\emptyset(\Delta) = 1$, and $h_S(\Delta) := \sum_{T \subseteq S} (-1)^{\#S - \#T} f_S(\Delta)$. The usual f-numbers and h-numbers can be recovered from the relations $f_{i-1}(\Delta) = \sum_{\#S=i} f_S(\Delta)$ and $h_i(\Delta) = \sum_{\#S=i} h_S(\Delta)$. The following symmetry of flag h-vectors of balanced spheres is well-known, see [2].

Lemma 2.2. *If Δ is a balanced homology $(d-1)$-sphere, then $h_S(\Delta) = h_{[d]\setminus S}(\Delta)$ for all $S \subseteq [d]$.*

In the reminder of this section, we establish some restrictions on the possible size of color sets of balanced neighborly spheres. In the following, V_i always denotes the set of vertices of color i.

Lemma 2.3. *Let Δ be a balanced k-neighborly homology $(2k-1)$-sphere. Then Δ has the same number of vertices of each color.*

Proof: Let W be an arbitrary subset of the set of colors, $[2k]$, of size k. Since Δ is balanced k-neighborly, Δ_W is also balanced k-neighborly, and hence Δ_W is the join of k color sets of colors in W, each considered as a 0-dimensional complex. By the fact that $h_k(\Delta_1 * \Delta_2) = \sum_{i=0}^{k} h_i(\Delta_1) h_{k-i}(\Delta_2)$ and by Lemma 2.2,

$$\prod_{i \in W} (|V_i| - 1) = \prod_{i \in W} h_1(\Delta_{\{i\}}) = h_{|W|}(\Delta) = h_{|2k|-|W|}(\Delta) = \prod_{i \in [2k]\setminus W} h_1(\Delta_{\{i\}}) = \prod_{i \in [2k]\setminus W} (|V_i| - 1).$$

Since $|[2k]\setminus W| = |W| = k$ and since $W \subseteq [2k]$ can be chosen arbitrarily, it follows that each color set in Δ must have the same size. $\square$

Lemma 2.4. *Let $d \geq 4$. If Δ is a balanced homology $(d-1)$-sphere and $V_d = \{v_1, v_2, v_3\}$ is the set of vertices of color d, then $\mathrm{lk}_\Delta v_i \cap \mathrm{lk}_\Delta v_j$ is a homology $(d-2)$-ball for any $1 \leq i < j \leq 3$, and $\cap_{k=1}^{3} \mathrm{lk}_\Delta v_k$ is a homology $(d-3)$-sphere.*

Proof: Let $\Sigma = \mathrm{lk}_\Delta v_i \cap \mathrm{lk}_\Delta v_j$ and $\Gamma = \cap_{k=1}^3 \mathrm{lk}_\Delta v_k$. Every facet σ of Γ is a $(d-3)$-face whose link in Δ is a 6-cycle that contains the vertices v_1, v_2, v_3, and hence σ is contained in exactly one facet $\sigma \cup \{w\}$ of Σ, where w is the unique adjacent vertex to both v_i, v_j in $\mathrm{lk}_\Delta \sigma$. We conclude that Γ is the boudary complex of Σ.

We prove that Σ and Γ have the same homology as a $(d-2)$-ball and $(d-3)$-sphere respectively. Since each $(d-2)$-face of Δ is contained in exactly 2 facets, it follows that $\mathrm{lk}_\Delta v_i \cup \mathrm{lk}_\Delta v_j = \Delta_{[d-1]}$. By the Mayer-Vietoris sequence, for any $n \geq 0$,

$$\cdots \to H_{n+1}(\Delta_{[d-1]}) \to H_n(\Sigma) \to H_n(\mathrm{lk}_\Delta v_i) \oplus H_n(\mathrm{lk}_\Delta v_j) \to H_n(\Delta_{[d-1]}) \to \cdots . \tag{2.1}$$

Note that $\Delta_{[d-1]}$ is a deformation retract of Δ minus three points, hence $\beta_{d-2}(\Delta_{[d-1]}) = 2$ and $\beta_k(\Delta_{[d-1]}) = 0$ for $0 \leq k \leq d-3$. We conclude from (2.1) that $\beta_k(\Sigma) = 0$ for all $k \geq 0$. Again by the Mayer-Vietoris sequence and the fact that $\mathrm{lk}_\Delta v_{[3]-\{i,j\}} \cup \Sigma = \Delta_{[d-1]}$, we obtain

$$\cdots \to H_{n+1}(\Delta_{[d-1]}) \to H_n(\Gamma) \to H_n(\mathrm{lk}_\Delta v_{[3]-\{i,j\}}) \oplus H_n(\Sigma) \to H_n(\Delta_{[d-1]}) \to \cdots .$$

Hence $\beta_{d-3}(\Gamma) = 1$ and $\beta_k(\Gamma) = 0$ for $0 \leq k \leq d-4$.

Next, for any $\tau \in \Gamma$, we have $\mathrm{lk}_\Sigma \tau = \mathrm{lk}_{\mathrm{lk}_\Delta \tau} v_i \cap \mathrm{lk}_{\mathrm{lk}_\Delta \tau} v_j$ and $\mathrm{lk}_\Gamma \tau = \cap_{i=1}^3 \mathrm{lk}_{\mathrm{lk}_\Delta \tau} v_i$. Since $\mathrm{lk}_\Delta \tau$ is a balanced homology $(d-1-|\tau|)$-sphere, using the same argument as above, we may show that $\mathrm{lk}_\Sigma \tau$ and $\mathrm{lk}_\Gamma \tau$ has the same homology as a $(d-2-|\tau|)$-ball and $(d-3-|\tau|)$-sphere respectively. Therefore Γ is a homology $(d-3)$-sphere. Finally, for any interior face σ of Σ, $\mathrm{lk}_\Sigma \sigma = \mathrm{lk}_{\mathrm{lk}_\Delta v_i} \sigma = \mathrm{lk}_{\mathrm{lk}_\Delta v_j} \sigma$, and hence $\mathrm{lk}_\Sigma \sigma$ is a homology sphere. By definition we conclude that Σ is a homology $(d-2)$-ball. □

Remark 2.5. The complex Γ in Lemma 2.4 is not balanced, since Γ is $(d-1)$-colorable instead of being $(d-2)$-colorable.

By Lemma 2.3, if balanced k-neighborly homology $(2k-1)$-spheres exist, then the number of vertices must be $2kl$ for some $l \geq 2$. However, as the following proposition shows, we cannot hope for the existence of such spheres for all values of $k \geq 2$ and $l \geq 2$.

Proposition 2.6. *No balanced 2-neighborly homology 3-spheres with 12 vertices exist.*

Proof: Assume that Δ is such a sphere. By Lemma 2.3, each color set of Δ has three vertices. We let $V_4 = \{z_1, z_2, z_3\}$ be the set of vertices of color 4. Since each $\mathrm{lk}_\Delta z_i$ is a 2-sphere with 9 vertices, its f-vector is (1,9,21,14). Furthermore, the balancedness implies that every vertex $v \in \mathrm{lk}_\Delta z_i$ has $\deg_{\mathrm{lk}_\Delta z_i} v = 4$ or 6. If x is the number of vertices of degree 6 in $\mathrm{lk}_\Delta z_i$, then

$$4(9-x) + 6x = \sum_{v \in \mathrm{lk}_\Delta z_i} f_0(\mathrm{lk}_{\mathrm{lk}_\Delta z_i} v) = 2f_1(\mathrm{lk}_\Delta z_i) = 42,$$

and hence $x = 3$. A balanced 2-sphere with 9 vertices, 3 of which have degree 6, is unique up to an isomorphism, as shown in Figure 1. It is immediate that the missing edges between vertices of different colors in this sphere form a 6-cycle.

On the other hand, $\Sigma := \mathrm{lk}_\Delta z_1 \cap \mathrm{lk}_\Delta z_2$ is a triangulated 2-ball by Lemma 2.4. If we delete all of the boundary edges from Σ, the resulting complex Σ' is still contractible. However, Σ does not have interior vertices. (An interior vertex of Σ would not be in $V(\mathrm{lk}_\Delta v_3)$, which would contradict the 2-neighborliness of Δ.) Hence the missing edges of $\mathrm{lk}_\Delta z_3$ that form a 6-cycle are the only



Figure 1: Left: triangulation of the vertex link $\mathrm{lk}_\Delta z_i$ for $z_i \in V_4$, where $\{u_1, u_2, u_3\}$, $\{v_1, v_2, v_3\}$ and $\{w_1, w_2, w_3\}$ are the three other color sets. Right: the missing edges between vertices of different color of $\mathrm{lk}_\Delta z_i$.

interior edges of Σ, i.e., Σ' is a 6-cycle. This contradicts that Σ' is contractible, so no such sphere exists. □

In fact, a stronger result holds.

Lemma 2.7. *Up to an isomorphism, there are only three triangulations of balanced 3-spheres with each color set of size 3.*

Proof: Let Δ be such a sphere and let $V_4 = \{z_1, z_2, z_3\}$. Each vertex link of Δ is a balanced 2-sphere with at most 9 vertices, hence it is either the octahedral sphere, the suspension of a 6-cycle, or the connected sum of two octahedral spheres. We denote these three 2-spheres as Σ_1, Σ_2 and Σ_3 respectively. By Lemma 2.4, $\Delta_{[3]}$ is the union of three triangulated 2-balls $B_i = \mathrm{lk}_\Delta z_j \cap \mathrm{lk}_\Delta z_k$, where $\{i, j, k\} = [3]$, glued along their common boundary complex c. Assume that $f_0(\mathrm{lk}_\Delta z_i) \leq f_0(\mathrm{lk}_\Delta z_j)$ when $i \leq j$. An easy counting leads to

$$f_0(\Delta_{[3]}) = f_0(c) + \sum_{i=1}^{3} f_0(B_i \backslash c) = 9, \quad f_0(\mathrm{lk}_\Delta z_i) = f_0(c) + f_0(B_j \backslash c) + f_0(B_k \backslash c) \in \{6, 8, 9\}.$$

In what follows we enumerate all possible values of the triple $(f_0(\mathrm{lk}_\Delta z_1), f_0(\mathrm{lk}_\Delta z_3), f_0(\mathrm{lk}_\Delta z_3))$:

1. $(f_0(\mathrm{lk}_\Delta z_1), f_0(\mathrm{lk}_\Delta z_2), f_0(\mathrm{lk}_\Delta z_3)) = (6, 6, 9)$ or $(6, 8, 9)$. Since $\mathrm{lk}_\Delta z_1$ is combinatorially equivalent to Σ_1, it follows that $\mathrm{lk}_\Delta v_3$ is obtained from $\mathrm{lk}_\Delta v_2$ by a cross flip (see [6] for a reference). So either $\mathrm{lk}_\Delta v_2 \cong \Sigma_1$, $\mathrm{lk}_\Delta v_3 \cong \Sigma_3$, and the cross flip replaces a 2-face of $\mathrm{lk}_\Delta v_2$ with its complement in the octahedral sphere; or $\mathrm{lk}_\Delta v_2 \cong \Sigma_2$, $\mathrm{lk}_\Delta v_3 \cong \Sigma_3$, and the cross flip replaces the union of three 2-faces of $\mathrm{lk}_\Delta v_2$ with its complement in the octahedral sphere.

2. $(f_0(\mathrm{lk}_\Delta z_1), f_0(\mathrm{lk}_\Delta z_2), f_0(\mathrm{lk}_\Delta z_3)) = (8, 8, 8)$ or $(8, 8, 9)$. In the former case, c is a 6-cycle and $\Delta_{[3]} \backslash c$ consists of three disjoint vertices. It is easy to see that at least one of these vertices has degree 6. Then the other two vertices must be of degree 6 as well, and hence $\Delta_{[3]}$ is the join of c and $\Delta_{[3]} \backslash c$. In the latter case, Since the vertices of degree 6 in $\mathrm{lk}_\Delta z_3$ form a 3-cycle, the two disjoint vertices in $\Delta_{[3]} \backslash c$ cannot both have degree 6 or 4. However, if one vertex of $\Delta_{[3]} \backslash c$ is of degree 6, then since $\mathrm{lk}_\Delta z_1$ and $\mathrm{lk}_\Delta z_2$ are combinatorially equivalent to Σ_2 and c is a 7-cycle, B_3 must be the join of one vertex u and a path of length 6. Then u is not connected to any vertex of $\Delta_{[3]} - c$, a contradiction.

3. $(f_0(\mathrm{lk}_\Delta z_2), f_0(\mathrm{lk}_\Delta z_3)) = (9,9)$. In this case, B_1 is a triangulated 2-ball with 9 vertices on the boundary. There is only one balanced 2-sphere with 9 vertices that contains B_1 (it is isomorphic to Σ_3), and hence $\mathrm{lk}_\Delta z_2 = \mathrm{lk}_\Delta z_3$, a contradiction.

In sum, we obtain three balanced 3-spheres with 12 vertices: S_1, the connected sum of two octahedral 3-spheres; S_2, the join of two 6-cycles, and S_3, with $\mathrm{lk}_\Delta z_i \cong \Sigma_i$ for $1 \leq i \leq 3$. □

Proposition 2.8. *No balanced 2-neighborly homology 4-spheres with each color set of size 3 exist.*

Proof: Let Δ be such a sphere and let v_1, v_2, v_3 be the vertices of color 5. By Alexander Duality, $\tilde{H}_i(\Delta_{\{4,5\}}) \cong \tilde{H}_{3-i}(\Delta_{[3]})$. In particular, since $\Delta_{\{4,5\}}$ is balanced 2-neighborly, $\beta_2(\Delta_{[3]}) = \beta_1(\Delta_{\{4,5\}}) = 4$ and $\beta_1(\Delta_{[3]}) = 0$. Hence

$$f_2(\Delta_{[3]}) = (f_1 - f_0 + \chi)(\Delta_{[3]}) = \frac{9 \cdot 6}{2} - 9 + 5 = 23.$$

By double counting, $\sum_{i=1}^{3} f_1(\mathrm{lk}_\Delta v_i) = \sum_{W=\{i,j,5\}\subseteq[5]} f_2(\Delta_W) = \binom{4}{2} f_2(\Delta_{[3]}) = 138$. Since $f_1(S_1) = 42$, $f_1(S_2) = 48$ and $f_1(S_3) = 46$, it follows that either $\mathrm{lk}_\Delta v_1 \cong S_1$ and $\mathrm{lk}_\Delta v_2, \mathrm{lk}_\Delta v_3 \cong S_2$, or $\mathrm{lk}_\Delta v_i \cong S_3$ for all i.

Consider the first case above. It can be checked that for any $W = \{i,j\}$, $f_1((\mathrm{lk}_\Delta v_1)_W) = 7$ and $f_1((\mathrm{lk}_\Delta v_2)_W) = 6$ or 9, depending on whether $(\mathrm{lk}_\Delta v_2)_W$ is a 6-cycle or not. Hence $f_2(\Delta_{W\cup\{5\}}) = \sum_{i=1}^{3} f_1((\mathrm{lk}_\Delta v_i)_W) \neq 23$, a contradiction. As for the second case, since $\mathrm{lk}_\Delta v_1 \cap \mathrm{lk}_\Delta v_2$ is a homology 3-ball with 12 vertices on the boundary, by Lemma 2.7 there is a unique balanced 3-sphere combinatorially equivalent to S_3 that contains $\mathrm{lk}_\Delta v_1 \cap \mathrm{lk}_\Delta v_2$ as a subcomplex. It follows that $\mathrm{lk}_\Delta v_1 = \mathrm{lk}_\Delta v_2$, a contradiction. Hence no balanced 2-neighborly homology 4-spheres with 15 vertices exist. □

Corollary 2.9. *The only balanced 3-neighborly homology 5-sphere with ≤ 18 vertices is the octahedral 5-sphere.*

Proof: Let Δ be such a sphere. The vertex links of Δ are balanced 2-neighborly 4-spheres with ≤ 16 vertices. By Proposition 2.8, it must be the suspension of a balanced 2-neighborly 3-sphere with ≤ 14 vertices. Then the result follows from Lemma 2.3 and Proposition 2.6. □

We propose the following conjecture motivated by Proposition 2.6 and Corollary 2.9.

Conjecture 2.10. *For an arbitrary $k \geq 2$, there does not exist a balanced k-neighborly homology $(2k-1)$-sphere with $6k$ vertices.*

3 First Construction

In this section we present our first construction of a balanced 2-neighborly 3-sphere with 16 vertices. We denote it by Δ. By Proposition 2.3, each color set of Δ has four vertices.

Construction 3.1. We denote the color sets of Δ by $V_1 = \{u_1, u_2, u_3, u_4\}$, $V_2 = \{v_1, v_2, v_3, v_4\}$, $V_3 = \{w_1, w_2, w_3, w_4\}$ and $V_4 = \{z_1, z_2, z_3, z_4\}$.

In Figure 2 we illustrate the construction of the vertex links $\mathrm{lk}_\Delta z_i$ for $i = 1, \ldots, 4$. All these links are realized as cylinders. Two links $\mathrm{lk}_\Delta z_1$ and $\mathrm{lk}_\Delta z_2$ share the same top and bottom, which



(a) $\mathrm{lk}_\Delta\, z_1$ (b) $\mathrm{lk}_\Delta\, z_2$

(c) $\mathrm{lk}_\Delta\, z_3$ (d) $\mathrm{lk}_\Delta\, z_4$

Figure 2: Four vertex links of Δ

are triangulated hexagons spanned by vertices $\{u_i, v_i, w_i : i = 1, 3\}$ and $\{u_i, v_i, w_i : i = 2, 4\}$, respectively. To construct $\mathrm{lk}_\Delta\, z_3$ from $\mathrm{lk}_\Delta\, z_1$, we switch the positions of vertices u_3, v_3, w_3 with vertices u_4, v_4, w_4 respectively and form a new cylinder. The new top and bottom hexagons contain the 2-faces $\{u_1, v_1, w_1\}$ and $\{u_2, v_2, w_2\}$. Similarly, we construct the link $\mathrm{lk}_\Delta\, z_4$ from $\mathrm{lk}_\Delta\, z_2$ by switching the positions of vertices u_3, v_3, w_3 with vertices u_4, v_4, w_4 and letting $\{u_1, v_1, w_1\}$ and $\{u_2, v_2, w_2\}$ be the 2-faces that appear in the triangulation of the top and bottom hexagons. It follows that $\mathrm{lk}_\Delta\, z_3$ and $\mathrm{lk}_\Delta\, z_4$ also share the same top and bottom.

Now since Δ is balanced 2-neighborly, by our construction, it only remains to show that Δ is a 3-sphere. The geometric realizations of $\mathrm{st}_\Delta\, z_1$ and $\mathrm{st}_\Delta\, z_2$ are filled cylinders that share top and bottom. So their union is a filled torus (that is, a genus-1 handlebody); so is the union of $\mathrm{st}_\Delta\, z_3$ and $\mathrm{st}_\Delta\, z_4$. Note that these two genus-1 handlebodies have identical boundary complexes, thus they provide a genus-1 Heegaard splitting of a 3-sphere, which is our Δ.

Remark 3.2. Our construction Δ has the following properties:

1. One can check that all vertex links are combinatorially equivalent. Furthermore, all 2-dimensional rank-selected subcomplexes of Δ are isomorphic.

2. The intersection of two vertex links, where the vertices are of the same color, always has at least two connected components. By the construction of Δ, $\mathrm{lk}_\Delta\, z_i \cap \mathrm{lk}_\Delta\, z_j$ has two connected

components when $\{i,j\} = \{1,2\}$ or $\{3,4\}$ (they are the top and bottom hexagons as shown in Figure 2); and it has three connected components when $i \in \{1,2\}$ and $j \in \{3,4\}$ (each component is the union of two facets along the side of the cylinders).

3. There are at least three group actions on the vertices of Δ:

   (a) Fix the subscript and rotate the corresponding vertices of color 1, 2 and 3 respectively. The generator is given by $(u_1v_1w_1)(u_2v_2w_2)(u_3v_3w_3)$.

   (b) Rotate vertices of the same color. The generator is

   $$(u_1u_3u_2u_4)(v_1v_3v_2v_4)(w_1w_3w_2w_4)(z_1z_3z_2z_4).$$

   (c) Exchange $\mathrm{lk}_\Delta z_1$ and $\mathrm{lk}_\Delta z_2$, $\mathrm{lk}_\Delta z_3$ and $\mathrm{lk}_\Delta z_4$, by exchanging v_i and w_i (or u_i and w_i, u_i and v_i) for all $i \in [4]$. The generators are $(z_1z_2)(z_3z_4)(v_1w_1)(v_2w_2)(v_3w_3)(v_4w_4)$, $(z_1z_2)(z_3z_4)(u_1w_1)(u_2w_2)(u_3w_3)(u_4w_4)$ and $(z_1z_2)(z_3z_4)(u_1v_1)(u_2v_2)(u_3v_3)(u_4v_4)$.

   Hence the automorphism group of Δ is of size at least 96.

Proposition 3.3. *There exist balanced 3-spheres whose 2-dimensional rank-selected subcomplexes do not have an ear decomposition.*

Proof: Consider the complex Δ in Construction 3.1 and its rank-selected subcomplex $\Delta_{[3]}$. Suppose $\Delta_{[3]}$ has an ear decomposition $(\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2, \cdots, \Gamma_k)$. Since $\Delta_{[3]}$ is the deformation retract of the sphere Δ minus 4 points, $\beta_2(\Delta_{[3]}) = 3$ and so k must be 3. Note that $\Delta_{[3]}$ is the union of three 3-balls $\mathrm{st}_\Delta z_i$ $(1 \le i \le 3)$ with three vertices z_1, z_2, z_3 removed. The only subcomplexes of $\Delta_{[3]}$ that can be realized as the boundary complexes of 3-balls must be the boundary complex of either $\mathrm{st}_\Delta z_i$, $\mathrm{st}_\Delta z_i \cup \mathrm{st}_\Delta z_j$ or $\cup_{i=1}^3 \mathrm{st}_\Delta z_i$. Using the second property of Δ in Remark 3.2, we conclude that $\Gamma_1 = \mathrm{lk}_\Delta z_i$ for some $i \in [4]$. Furthermore, $\partial\Gamma_2$ divides Γ_1 into two 2-balls B_1 and B_2. Hence $B_1 \cup \Gamma_2$ is also a 2-sphere. Then the above argument yields that $B_1 \cup \Gamma_2 = \mathrm{lk}_\Delta z_j$ for some $j \neq i$. This, however, leads to a contradiction, since $\mathrm{lk}_\Delta z_i \cap \mathrm{lk}_\Delta z_j$ has at least two connected components. Hence $\Delta_{[3]}$ does not have an ear decomposition. □

In the following we describe two balanced non-shellable 3-balls which are subcomplexes of Δ. Recall that a simplicial $(d-1)$-ball B is called *shellable* if its facets can be ordered $(F_1, F_2, \ldots, F_n)$ in such a way that the intersection of a facet with the union of previous facets is pure $(d-2)$-dimensional. Such an ordering of facets is called a *shelling*. A facet of B is defined to be *free* if its intersection with the boundary of B is a $(d-2)$-ball. A simplicial ball B is called *strongly non-shellable* if it has no free facet. Observe that if B is a shellable ball with more than one facet, and $(F_1, \ldots, F_n)$ is a shelling of B, then F_n must be a free facet. Hence if B is a strongly non-shellable ball, then B is non-shellable. For more discussion on shellability, see Ziegler's book [22].

Construction 3.4. Our construction begins with the balanced 3-sphere Δ in Construction 3.1. Remove the vertex z_4 from Δ and denote the resulting complex by B_1. Then B_1 is a balanced 3-ball with 15 vertices (z_1, z_2 and z_3 are the only interior vertices) and 60 facets. The boundary of B_1 is exactly $\mathrm{lk}_\Delta z_4$. In particular, six 2-faces that form three connected components are from $\mathrm{lk}_{B_1} z_1$, another six 2-faces are from $\mathrm{lk}_{B_1} z_2$ and the remaining eight 2-faces that form two connected components are from $\mathrm{lk}_{B_1} z_3$ (see part 2 of Remark 3.2). We denote by a_1 the union of two adjacent faces $\{u_3v_2w_1\}$ and $\{u_4v_2w_1\}$ in $\mathrm{lk}_{B_1} z_1$, by a_2 the union of $\{u_3v_4w_1\}$ and $\{u_3v_4w_2\}$ in $\mathrm{lk}_{B_1} z_2$, and by a_3 the top triangulated hexagon in $\mathrm{lk}_{B_2} z_3 = \mathrm{lk}_\Delta z_3$, as shown in Figure 2(c).

From B_1 we construct another 3-ball B_2 by deleting the eight 3-faces in $\cup_{i=1}^{3}(a_i * z_i)$. The resulting complex, denoted as B_2, is a balanced 3-ball with 15 vertices (all of them are on the boundary of B_2) and 52 facets, see Figure 3 for a view of the boundary of B_2.



(a) ∂B_2, front view (b) ∂B_2, back view

Figure 3: The front view and back view of ∂B_2. The faces from $\mathrm{st}_\Delta z_1$, $\mathrm{st}_\Delta z_2$ and $\mathrm{st}_\Delta z_3$ are colored in pink, green and blue respectively.

Proposition 3.5. *The balanced 3-ball B_2 in Construction 3.4 is strongly non-shellable.*

Proof: Since every vertex of B_2 is on the boundary, the intersection of any facet σ and ∂B_2 must contain four vertices of different colors. Furthermore, if $\sigma \cap \partial B_2$ is pure 2-dimensional, then it contains at least two adjacent facets of ∂B_2. It can be checked that there are 18 pairs of adjacent 2-faces of ∂B_2 such that all four vertices are of different colors, but none of them can be realized as a subcomplex of a facet of B_2, a contradiction. Hence B_2 has no free facet, i.e., it is strongly non-shellable. □

We proceed to show that B_1 is also non-shellable.

Proposition 3.6. *The balanced 3-ball B_1 in Construction 3.4 is non-shellable.*

Proof: Assume that B_1 has a shelling $\tau_1, \tau_2, \ldots, \tau_{60}$, and for $1 \leq j \leq 3$, τ_{n_j} is the last facet of $\mathrm{st}_\Delta z_j$ that appears in the shelling; assume further that $\tau_{n_j} \backslash \{z_j\}$ belongs to a connected component, denoted as a_j, in $\mathrm{lk}_\Delta z_j \cap \mathrm{lk}_\Delta z_4$, where Δ is the balanced 3-sphere in Construction 3.1. Note that τ_{60} is a facet of $\Gamma = \cup_{j=1}^{3}(a_j * z_j)$. Now assume that $\tau_{60-i}, \ldots, \tau_{60}$ are facets of Γ for some $0 \leq i \leq 6$. If $\tau_{59-i} \notin \Gamma$, then by our assumption $n_j \geq 60 - i$ for any $1 \leq j \leq 3$, and so $\cup_{j=1}^{59-i}\tau_j$ is a 3-ball with no interior vertices. Moreover, the intersection $\tau_{59-i} \cap (\cup_{j=1}^{58-i}\tau_j)$ satisfies the following two conditions: 1) it contains all four vertices of τ_{59-i}, and 2) it is a subcomplex of $\tau_{59-i} \cap (B_1 \backslash \Gamma)$. However, a similar argument as in the proof of Proposition 3.5 yields that $\tau_{59-i} \cap (B_1 \backslash \Gamma)$ cannot be pure 2-dimensional. Hence $\tau_{59-i} \in \Gamma$.

By induction, the eight facets of Γ are $\tau_{53}, \ldots, \tau_{60}$. This implies $B_1 \backslash \Gamma$ is shellable. However, the proof of Proposition 3.5 shows that $B_1 \backslash \Gamma$ is strongly non-shellable, a contradiction. □

Corollary 3.7. *The 3-sphere Δ in Construction 3.1 is non-polytopal.*

Proof: If Δ is polytopal, then there exists a shelling of Δ that ends with the facets of $st_{\Delta} z_4$, see [22, Lemma 8.10 and Theorem 8.12]. Hence $B_1 = \Delta \backslash \{z_4\}$ is shellable, which contradicts Proposition 3.6. $\square$

Remark 3.8. At present, we do not know if the complex Δ is shellable or not.

4 Second Construction

In section 3 we constructed a balanced 2-neighborly 3-sphere all of whose 2-dimensional rank-selected subcomplexes have no ear decompositions. Now we provide a second construction that is not combinatorially equivalent to Construction 3.1.



Figure 4: Discs A, B and C (from left to right)



Figure 5: Left: disc D'. Right: disc D obtained after rearranging the boundary of D'.

Construction 4.1. Assume that $V_1 = \{u_1, u_2, u_3, u_4\}$, $V_2 = \{v_1, v_2, v_3, v_4\}$, $V_3 = \{w_1, w_2, w_3, w_4\}$ and $V_4 = \{z_1, z_2, z_3, z_4\}$ are the four color sets of a balanced 3-sphere Γ. We let $\mathrm{lk}_{\Gamma} z_1 = A \cup_{\partial A \sim \partial C} C$ and $\mathrm{lk}_{\Gamma} z_3 = B \cup_{\partial B \sim \partial C} C$, where A, B and C are triangulated 2-balls sharing the same boundary as shown in Figure 4. All possible edges that do not appear in A, B and C are shown in Figure 5 as solid red edges in disc D'. Notice that the dashed edges in D' are edges in discs A and B, so we may rearrange the boundary of D by switching the positions of vertices v_1 and v_2, and then replacing the edges containing v_1 or v_2 in $\partial D'$ by the dashed edges. In this way, we obtain a



Figure 6: Left: disc A'. Right: disc B'. Notice that $\partial A' = \partial B' = \partial D$.

triangulation of a 12-gon D as shown in Figure 5. Furthermore, $\partial D \subseteq A \cup B$, and ∂D divides the sphere $= A \cup_{\partial A \sim \partial B} B$ into two discs A' and B' as shown in Figure 6.

We let $\operatorname{lk}_\Gamma z_2 = A' \cup_{\partial A' \sim \partial D} D$ and $\operatorname{lk}_\Gamma z_4 = B' \cup_{\partial B' \sim \partial D} D$. It is not hard to see that the complex Γ with the given four links is indeed a balanced 2-neighborly 3-sphere.

Here we list some properties of Γ in Construction 4.1. First, $(A \cup B, C, D)$ is an ear decomposition of $\Gamma_{[3]}$. Since property 1 of Remark 3.2 and Proposition 3.3 implies that all 2-dimensional rank-selected subcomplexes of the 3-sphere in Construction 3.1 do not have an ear decomposition, we conclude that Γ is not combinatorially equivalent to Construction 3.1. Alternatively, we may prove non-equivalence by inspecting the vertex links. In Construction 3.1, all vertex links are combinatorially equivalent; however, there are two types of vertex links of Γ: $\operatorname{lk}_\Gamma z_i$ and $\operatorname{lk}_\Gamma v_i$ for $i = 1, 2$ are combinatorially equivalent to the triangulated spheres in Figure 2 (to see this, note that the light red triangles that appear in discs A and A' correspond to the middle triangles in the top and bottom hexagons of the cylinders in Figure 2); the other 12 vertex links are combinatorially equivalent to the balanced 2-sphere with 12 vertices such that exactly two of its vertices have degree 8.

Second, the automorphism group of Γ has at least two generators

$$(u_1u_3u_2u_4)(v_1z_2v_2z_1)(v_3z_4v_4z_3)(w_1w_4w_2w_3),\ (z_1v_1)(z_2v_2)(z_3v_3)(z_4v_4)(u_1w_1)(u_2w_2)(u_3w_3)(u_4w_4).$$

(The second generator is given by switching vertices of color 1 and 3, and color 2 and 4, but with the same subscript.) Hence $\operatorname{Aut}(\Delta)$ has at least 8 elements.

Remark 4.2. The Construction 4.1 is shellable. For $\operatorname{lk}_\Gamma z_1 = A \cup_{\partial A \sim \partial C} C$, there exist two shellings $c_1, \ldots, c_{10}, a_1, \ldots, a_{10}$ and $a'_1, \ldots, a'_{10}, c'_1, \ldots, c'_{10}$ such that for any $1 \leq i \leq 10$, c_i, c'_i are facets from C and a_i, a'_i are facets from A. Similarly, there exist two shellings $c_1, \ldots, c_{10}, b_1, \ldots, b_{10}$ and $b'_1, \ldots, b'_{10}, c'_1, \ldots, c'_{10}$ for $\operatorname{lk}_\Gamma z_3 = B \cup_{\partial B \sim \partial C} C$, where b_i, b'_i are facets from B. Then

$$a'_1 * z_1, \ldots, a'_{10} * z_1, c'_1 * z_1, \ldots, c'_{10} * z_1, c_1 * z_3, \ldots, c_{10} * z_3, , b_1 * z_3 \ldots, b_{10} * z_3$$

gives a shelling of $\operatorname{st}_\Gamma z_1 \cup \operatorname{st}_\Gamma z_3$. We may extend this shelling into a complete shelling of Γ by constructing two similar shellings of $\operatorname{lk}_\Gamma z_2$ and $\operatorname{lk}_\Gamma z_4$. However, we have not been able to check whether Γ is polytopal or not.

Remark 4.3. It is easy to see that if Δ_1 is a balanced 2-neighborly (d_1-1)-sphere and Δ_2 is a balanced 2-neighborly (d_2-1)-sphere, then $\Delta_1 * \Delta_2$ is a balanced 2-neighborly (d_1+d_2-1)-sphere. Hence by taking joins, we find balanced 2-neighborly $(4k-1)$-spheres with $16k$ vertices for any $k \geq 1$.

Question 4.4. *Let $d \geq 4$ and $m \geq 5$ be arbitrary integers. Is there a balanced 2-neighborly simplicial $(d-1)$-sphere all of whose color sets have the same size m? Is there a polytopal sphere with these properties?*

5 Third Construction

In general, there are many balanced 3-spheres, not necessarily 2-neighborly, such that some of their rank-selected subcomplexes have no ear decompositions. Here we present an example different from Construction 3.1. Its rank-selected subcomplex can be embedded in $\mathbb{R}^3$.

The strategy is that we want to construct a balanced 3-sphere Δ so that for a fixed color set $W = \{v_1, \cdots, v_5\}$, the intersection of any two vertex links $\mathrm{lk}_\Delta v_i \cap \mathrm{lk}_\Delta v_j$ always has at least two connected components. In Figure 7 we show the links $\mathrm{lk}_\Delta v_1, \cdots, \mathrm{lk}_\Delta v_4$. Every label represents the color of the vertex. Also each connected component of $\mathrm{lk}_\Delta v_1 \cap \mathrm{lk}_\Delta v_2$ is colored in green, $\mathrm{lk}_\Delta v_i \cap \mathrm{lk}_\Delta v_3$ is colored in blue for $i = 1, 2$, and $\mathrm{lk}_\Delta v_j \cap \mathrm{lk}_\Delta v_4$ is colored in pink for $j = 1, 2, 3$. Immediately we check that all these intersections of vertex links have 2 or 3 connected components.



(a) $\mathrm{lk}_\Delta v_1$ and $\mathrm{lk}_\Delta v_2$ (b) $\mathrm{lk}_\Delta v_3$ (c) $\mathrm{lk}_\Delta v_4$

Figure 7: Four vertex links as triangulated 2-spheres. For simplicity's sake, we omit some diagonal edges in the quadrilaterals in (b), and some labels of vertices in (c).

Figure 8 shows how $\Delta \backslash W$ is formed from these links. First we glue $\mathrm{lk}_\Delta v_1$ and $\mathrm{lk}_\Delta v_2$ along two green triangles. The resulting complex $\mathrm{lk}_\Delta v_1 \cup \mathrm{lk}_\Delta v_2$ is shown in Figure 8a. Then we place $\mathrm{lk}_\Delta v_3$ on top of $\mathrm{lk}_\Delta v_1 \cup \mathrm{lk}_\Delta v_2$. As we see from Figure 8b, the boundary complex of $\cup_{i=1}^3 \mathrm{st}_\Delta v_i$ is a triangulated torus. Finally, we place $\mathrm{lk}_\Delta v_4$ on top of $\cup_{i=1}^3 \mathrm{lk}_\Delta v_i$ so that $\mathrm{st}_\Delta v_4$ "covers the 1-dimensional hole" in $\cup_{i=1}^3 \mathrm{st}_\Delta v_i$, see Figure 8c. We denote the subspace of $\mathbb{R}^3$ enclosed by $\mathrm{lk}_\Delta v_i$ as S_i for $1 \leq i \leq 4$, and let $S_5 := \cup_{i \leq 4} S_i$. From our construction it follows that the boundary complex of S_5 is a 2-sphere; we let it be $\mathrm{lk}_\Delta v_5$.

Since each $\mathrm{lk}_\Delta v_i \cap \mathrm{lk}_\Delta v_j$ has at least two connected components for $1 \leq i \neq j \leq 4$, the Mayer-Vietoris sequence implies that $S_i \cup S_j$ is not contractible for all $1 \leq i \neq j \leq 4$. A similar inspection



(a) $\mathrm{lk}_\Delta v_1 \cup \mathrm{lk}_\Delta v_2$ (b) $\cup_{i=1}^3 \mathrm{lk}_\Delta v_i$ (c) $\cup_{i=1}^4 \mathrm{lk}_\Delta v_4$

Figure 8: how the links are glued together.

of $\mathrm{lk}_\Delta v_i \cup \mathrm{lk}_\Delta v_j \cup \mathrm{lk}_\Delta v_k$ also implies that the boundary complexes of $S_i \cup S_j \cup S_k$'s cannot be triangulated 2-spheres for distinct $1 \leq i, j, k \leq 4$.

Now we prove that $\Delta \backslash W$ does not have an ear decomposition by using a similar argument to the one in the proof of Proposition 3.3. In the following we denote the union of interior faces of a complex τ by $\mathrm{int}\,\tau$. Suppose $\Delta \backslash W$ has an ear decomposition $(\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2, \cdots, \Gamma_k)$. Since $|W| = 5$ and $\beta_2(\Delta \backslash W) = 4$, k must be 4. Notice first that $\cup_{i \leq 4} \mathrm{lk}_\Delta v_i$ divides $\mathbb{R}^3$ into five subspaces, namely, $S_1, \cdots, S_4$ and the complement of S_5, each having $\mathrm{lk}_\Delta v_i$ as the boundary complex for $1 \leq i \leq 5$ respectively. Since $\Gamma_1 \cup \Gamma_2 - \mathrm{int}(\Gamma_1 \cap \Gamma_2)$ must be a triangulated 2-sphere, by the Jordan theorem, it separates $\mathbb{R}^3$ into two connected components, hence the bounded component must be either $S_i \cup S_j$ or $S_i \cup S_j \cup S_k$ for some $1 \leq i, j, k \leq 4$. (We may assume that it is not S_i, since otherwise we may consider the 2-sphere $\cup_{i \leq 3} \Gamma_i - \cup_{1 \leq i \neq j \leq 3} \mathrm{int}(\Gamma_i \cap \Gamma_j)$ instead of $\Gamma_1 \cup \Gamma_2 - \mathrm{int}(\Gamma_1 \cap \Gamma_2)$, where the subset enclosed by this sphere in $\mathbb{R}^3$ cannot be S_i anymore.) This contradicts the fact that the boundaries of $S_i \cup S_j$ or $S_i \cup S_j \cup S_k$ are not 2-spheres.

Remark 5.1. One can think of all the figures illustrated above as projections of a subcomplex of $\Delta - \mathrm{st}_\Delta v_5$ onto $\mathbb{R}^3$. However, we do not know whether the complex provided in this section can be realized as the boundary of a 4-polytope.

Acknowledgements

The author was partially supported by a graduate fellowship from NSF grant DMS-1361423. I thank Moritz Firsching for pointing out the automorphism groups of the constructions in Section 3 and 4 and running some computational tests to decide whether the constructions are polytopal.

References

[1] G. Burton: The non-neighbourliness of centrally symmetric convex polytopes having many vertices, *J. Combin. Theory Ser. A* **58** (1991), 321-322.

[2] M. Bayer and L. Billera: Counting faces and chains in polytopes and posets, *Contemp. Math.* **34** (1984), 207-252.

[3] M. K. Chari: Two decompositions in topological combinatorics with applications to matroid complexes, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **349** (1997), 3925-3943.

[4] D. L. Donoho and J. Tanner: Counting the faces of randomly-projected hypercubes and orthants, with applications, *Discrete Comput. Geom.* **43** (2010), 522-541.

[5] B. Grünbaum: *Convex polytopes*, Interscience, London, 1967.

[6] I. Izmestiev, S. Klee and I. Novik: Simplicial moves on balanced complexes, arXiv:1512.04384.

[7] W. Jockusch: An infinite family of nearly neighborly centrally symmetric 3-spheres, *J. Combin. Theory. Ser. A* **72** (1995), 318-321.

[8] M. Joswig and T. Rörig: Neighborly cubical polytopes and spheres, *Israel J. Math.* **159** (2007), 221-242.

[9] M. Joswig and G. M. Ziegler: Neighborly cubical polytopes, *Discrete Comput. Geom.* **24** (2000), 325-344.

[10] P. McMullen: The maximum number of faces of a convex polytope, *Mathematika* **17** (1970), 179-184.

[11] M. Juhnke-Kubitzke and S. Murai: Balanced generalized lower bound inequality for simplicial polytopes, arXiv:1503.06430.

[12] N. Linial and I. Novik: How neighborly can a centrally symmetric polytope be?, *Discrete Comput. Geom.* **36** (2006), 273-281.

[13] F. Lutz: Small examples of nonconstructible simplicial balls and sphere, *SIAM J. Discrete Math.*, **18** (2004), 103-109.

[14] A. Padrol: Many neighborly polytopes and oriented matroids, *Discrete Comput. Geom.* **50** (2013), 865-902.

[15] J. Pfeifle, V. Pilaud and F. Santos: Polytopality and Cartesian products of graphs, *Israel J. Math.* **192** (2012), 121-141.

[16] R. Sanyal and G. M. Ziegler: Construction and analysis of projected deformed products, *Discrete Comput. Geom.* **43** (2010), 412-435.

[17] I. Shermer: Neighborly polytopes, *Israel J. Math.* **43** (1982), 291-314.

[18] R. Stanley: The upper bound conjecture and Cohen-Macaulay rings, *Studies in Applied Math.* **54** (1975), 135-142.

[19] R. Stanley: Balanced Cohen-Macaulay complexes, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **249** (1979), 139-157.

[20] E. Swartz: g-elements, finite buildings and higher Cohen-Macaulay connectivity, *J. Combin. Theory. Ser. A* **113** (2006), 1305-1320.

[21] A. Vince: A non-shellable 3-sphere, *European J. Combin.*, 6 (1985), 91-100.

[22] G. Ziegler: Lectures on Polytopes, Volume 152 of Graduate Texts in Math., *Springer-Verlag, New York*, 1995, revised ed., 1998.